

it may not be—we really don't know. Why? Because the Federal Government has no system in place today to regulate the transfer of these agents within the United States. I think that's a situation that needs to be corrected, and I am introducing legislation today to do so.

Why worry about the flow of potentially dangerous infectious agents within our borders? Let me read you a few lines from an article on the threat posed by these agents when they are converted into biological weapons, written by U.S. Navy Commander Stephen Rose for the Naval War College Review. Cmdr. Rose writes that:

Science can now reshuffle the genetic deck of micro-organisms to produce a theoretically unlimited number of combinations, each with its own unique blend of toxicity, hardness, incubation period, etc. In short, it is becoming possible to synthesize biological agents to military specifications. Thus, the world lies on the threshold of a dangerous era of designer bugs as well as designer drugs.

Biological weapons have been called the poor man's atomic bomb. They are relatively cheap to produce, and you get an appallingly big bang for your buck. In fact, experts report that some of the supertoxins that have been developed in recent years are ten thousand times more potent than the nerve gases we are more accustomed to, which have been described as mere perfume in comparison to some of their biological competitors. The Office of Technology Assessment reports that some 15 nations, including Libya, North Korea, and Iraq, are suspected of having biological weapons development programs.

Clearly, the potential of biological weapons to rain devastation down upon their victims should give those charged with preventing international terrorist attacks on our Nation cause for serious concern. However, the lesson we learned from the tragedy at Oklahoma City is that we cannot be satisfied to only look outward for terrorist threats. We must also be vigilant against home-grown threats from paramilitary groups within our borders, which could use biological or chemical weapons against their fellow Americans to further their radical anti-government agendas.

On the morning of March 20, 1995, the Japanese Government was faced with just such a situation. A home-grown Armageddon-group called Aum Shinrikyo released sarin gas—a deadly nerve agent that is 500 times more toxic than cyanide gas—in the Tokyo subway system, killing 12 people and injuring thousands more. According to a staff report on the incident prepared by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, the Aum sect had its own chemical weapons manufacturing plant, for the production of sarin gas, and was trying to develop biological weapons, including botulism and anthrax. To get a sense of power of those weapons, consider this: 3 billionths of an ounce of botulism toxin would be enough to kill me.

Incidentally, the staff report concluded that the Aum sect was "a clear danger to not only the Japanese Government but also to the security interests of the United States," which was the target of much of the Aum leader's rhetoric.

In an effort to reduce the risk of a similar attack in the United States, I am introducing legislation directing the Centers for Disease Control to develop a regulatory regime to control

access to those infectious agents that could pose the greatest threat to public health if they fell into the wrong hands. It is my understanding that a working group including representatives of CDC, the Department of Justice, and other relevant Federal agencies already has begun to develop such a regime. My bill would ensure that that work is completed and the system is in place within 1 year of its enactment. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Budget Chairman JOHN KASICH and Representative JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II.

I am hopeful that this legislation will be given the swift attention that the issue it addresses demands in the House, and that the Senate will take up similar legislation soon.

NATION'S TRUE ECONOMIC PICTURE

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1996

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, who said this? "Washington has abandoned working families. Millions of Americans are running harder and harder just to stay in place. Wages are flat * * *

On February 20, 1996 the Labor Department released its employment cost index, showing the smallest gain in wages and benefits since the Government began keeping statistics in 1982.

A far more disturbing figure was given about the median family income. Under Ronald Reagan's watch, 1982–89, real income increased an average of 2 percent annually. President Clinton declared in his 1996 State of the Union "Our economy is the healthiest it has been in three decades."

How does the current rate of recovery compare to other periods of recovery over the past 35 years? In 1961 through 1969 the increased real gross domestic product was 23.5 percent from the low point of the recession. The 1975–80 figure increased by 20 percent. The 1982–90 recovery saw an increase of 17.9 percent. I wonder how President Clinton could make such a claim about the state of our Nation's economy since the recovery from the recession in March 1991 has only been 13.1 percent so far.

A major factor in the 1992 Presidential election was the economy. "It's the economy, stupid" was the hue and cry of the Clinton campaign. Just as President Bush was reminded over and over again during the 1992 campaign about the promise he made: "Read my lips, no new taxes." President Clinton may also come to realize just how salty his words may become. No doubt he will be haunted by "it's the economy, stupid" during his campaign for reelection. President Bush took his licks about his tax promise; President Clinton will be subjected to the same standard of scrutiny and criticism. After all, he did run on improving the economy. He stated that he believed America should come first. That he would make the U.S. economy vibrant and he would be known for his domestic policy, not just his foreign policy. He said America will come first.

Well here we are 4 years later. Guess what? The economy does not seem to be improving, rather it is stagnating. Edward Yardeni, chief economist at Deutsche Morgan

Grenfell, has stated: "The U.S. is already in recession," "even though we haven't had two straight quarters of negative growth in gross domestic product." He believes that GDP will shrink at a 1.5 percent annual rate during the first half of 1996. How did he draw this conclusion? Since the Commodity Research Bureau's price index of raw industrial materials fell 6 percent for the 12 months in January, this was the signal that led him to make this conclusion.

Let's be clear about one very important fact. In the third quarter of 1992, the economy grew 5.8 percent—the Commerce Department announced this number after the 1992 election. President Bush tried in vain to get this message across but neither the press nor the media seemed the least bit interested. Why give the American public the facts? For the record, the growth rate for the fourth quarter was an outstanding 8.6 percent. So, President Clinton could claim that under his administration the average annual rate of growth was 2.5 percent since 1993.

Let's examine what happened in 1995, the first year President Clinton's economic policies were fully in effect. Growth that year was a dismal 1.4 percent. How does this compare to other administrations? From 1982 to 1989, the average rate of growth was 3.9 percent. During that same period the annual median family income rose about 2 percent yearly. How does the Clinton administration compare with the Reagan administration? Unfortunately, for all of us the family income has only risen 0.25 percent per annum.

You might say to yourself that all might be true but President Clinton fulfilled his promise and created almost 8 million new jobs. OK, let's take a look at his claim. The Bureau of Labor Statistics backs up the President's numbers. He has lived up to his promise and created 7.5 million new jobs since taking office in January 1993. What is deceptive about these numbers is that the Bureau of Labor Statistics counts people, not the number of hours they work. For instance, two 20 hour per week part-timers are counted as two jobs. If you look at the number of hours worked, then only 758,000 new jobs have been created annually since 1993.

The Wall Street Journal reported on January 24, 1996 that during a Democrat focus group, a pollster announced that thanks to Clinton 8 million new jobs had been created. At that point, one woman yelled out: "Yeah, I know, I have three of them." This response reinforces what the Bureau of Labor Statistics found during its review of the number and types of jobs that were actually created under the Clinton administration.

It has become very apparent, especially in the last few months, that people are feeling insecure and anxious. Many have expressed the fear that if they lose their job they will not be able to find a new job that will provide them with the salary that will allow them to have the same standard of living. What has caused American workers to think this way? There are several factors which account for this negative outlook. Corporate downsizing has had the greatest impact upon middle managers. The statistics bear out the fact that many of these people trying to reenter the market must accept lower pay. Between 1990 and 1992, on average, these workers were forced to take a pay cut of 20 percent. You might find it hard to believe but the median income is less now than it was in 1986.

There is compelling evidence to show that reaching middle class earnings has been on the decline since 1980. According to the University of Michigan's Panel Study on Dynamics, which has tracked the same families since 1968, they found that 65 percent of white American men who turned 21 before 1980 were earning middle class wages—twice the poverty level—by the age of 30. By comparison, only 47 percent of those who reached the age of 21 after 1980 were able to reach this same level of earning power. Blacks do not fare half as well, reaching 29 and 19 percent, respectively.

Since there are more people without a college education than people with the benefit of a higher education, these workers tend to be far more insecure and anxious.

Education can be an influential factor as to how successful an individual will be in securing a well-paid job. Education is becoming a much more important factor in finding good job opportunities than ever before. As a result, the gap in income distribution is increasing, and this is adding to blue collar anxiety.

We must find ways to encourage our workers to get the necessary jobs skills to compete in this high tech global economy. We must also find a way to provide this training to retrain our workers.

We must expand our technological base and find creative and innovative methods to create new industries. In the past, we have been able to transfer a worker's knowledge and ability into learning new skills to allow them to participate in a new job market. A good example of this is when Henry Ford created the automobile and displaced the horse and buggy trade.

What happened is a lesson that we should all try to emulate. These same workers started working in the Ford factories that had displaced them. The telecommunications bill passed by Congress and signed into law by the President will provide the same type of opportunities by creating millions of new jobs.

So far, President Clinton hasn't delivered. If we balance the budget, we will be well on our way to jump starting.

Why is a 7-year balanced budget so important? Many leading economists believe that a balanced budget would result in a drop in interest rates of up to 2 percent. For a 30-year, \$75,000 mortgage, that's \$37,000 saved over the life of the loan. Americans will have more take home pay because our budget includes a \$500 per child tax credit. We also have true welfare reform, which is a No. 1 priority for most Americans.

TRIBUTE TO WALTER W. KRUEGER, A DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN WHO SERVED IN WORLD WAR II AND FOUGHT FOR VETERANS' RIGHTS

HON. FRANK TEJEDA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1996

Mr. TEJEDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of an American soldier, a man who dedicated his life to the defense of the freedoms that we enjoy and to the veterans who paid for those freedoms with their sacrifice. I respectfully request that the

U.S. House of Representatives join me in mourning the passage of Walter W. Krueger, a man of both vision and action. Having served this Nation for so long, Walter Krueger understood the problems of our noncommissioned officers. So after his service to this Nation was over, at a time when many hang up their uniforms, salute the flag, and retire, Walter Krueger went to work for the noncommissioned officers of this Nation. And when Walter Krueger went to work, good things happened.

Mr. Krueger served this Nation honorably in the U.S. Army for 33 years. When he retired, he was serving as Command Sergeant Major of the U.S. Army, Europe [ASAREUR]. He served this Nation all over the world, including assignments in Panama, Korea, Europe and Vietnam. During his long and very honorable career, he earned the Combat Infantryman's Badge and the Distinguished Service Medal.

While still serving this Nation in Europe, Mr. Krueger was appointed to the board of directors of the Noncommissioned Officers Association. Upon retirement, he was elected vice president of the association. A year later, he became president.

Walter Krueger's accomplishment as president of the association are legendary. The Organization received a Federal Charter from this U.S. Congress. The association began its medical trust, which awards funds each year to military families who need the assistance. It significantly raised the funding for and number of scholarships awarded to deserving young people. The NCOA operation appreciation program raised funds for equipment to be used by veterans in hospitals. Under his leadership, the organization began the NCOA national defense foundation, which works to ensure that active duty military enjoy their full right to participate in the democracy which they defend. Mr. Krueger received every award offered by the association, as is fitting for a man who led this organization so well and for so long, a man who fought for the rights and benefits due our noncommissioned officers, and who took every opportunity to honor and fight for our veterans.

I respectfully ask that this U.S. House of Representatives note the passage of this singular and distinguished American, and that we send our deepest condolences to Walter Krueger's wife, Betty Krueger, to his mother, Ruth Drees, to his five daughters, Kathy Logan, Karen Pagel, Judy Shaw, Pam Salada, and Patty Krueger, to his eight grandchildren, and to both his sisters. Walter Krueger was a strong family man, who loved this Nation and all that it stands for, who served all of the citizens of this country, first as a member of our armed services and then as an unparalleled advocate for our veterans. I am proud to call him my friend, and I am proud to ask that the House of Representatives of the Nation he loved so much take a moment to return to him a little of the honor and respect he showed us throughout his life.

COMMEMORATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am as proud as a father today, to have this opportunity to pay tribute to Vicky L. Bandy, of Beckley, WV, during Black History Month. For more than a decade, Ms. Bandy served as my executive assistant here in Washington, and Ms. Bandy was ever as loyal and dedicated as she was a professional, at all times and in all situations. I knew that I could depend upon her in all things.

Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1996, Ms. Bandy gave a speech at the Beckley Federal Correctional Institution's Black Affairs Banquet, as part of its celebration of Black History Month.

I am privileged to place in the RECORD at this point, Ms. Bandy's stirring words as she encouraged and surely inspired her sisters as she spoke eloquently about their theme: African-American Women: Past, Present and Future. Mr. Speaker, I commend Ms. Bandy's remarks to my colleagues for their reading and their remembrance.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN WOMEN: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

(By Vicky L. Bandy)

"Stony the road we trod, bitter the chastening rod, felt in the days when hope unborn had died."

Today, we gather 370 years after the first African American landed at Jamestown, Virginia, 133 years after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, and 31 years after the Enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which gave African Americans power at the Ballot Box.

Last October, the African American Community pledged itself to pursue a bold new course with the success of the Million Man March.

The success of the effort is still being felt. But today, ladies, it is our turn. The Theme for the 1996 observance of Black History Month is: African American Women: Past, Present and Future.

As I thought about what I would say, I thought about how far we as African Americans have come. I thought of the stories that were told to me by my Grandmother, Ella Bandy. I recall stories about how this Strong Black Woman worked hard in the fields of Alabama. She would leave her babies in a wagon under a shade tree, while she worked the long rows of the fields. At the end of each row, she would run back to check on her babies. Grandmama was a strong African American Woman. She never gave up, she was a woman of principle; and she never gave in. Grandmama's hands, hard and calloused from toiling in the hot Alabama Sun, so that her children and grandchildren could have a better way of life.

Earlier this week, I witnessed the Swearing-In ceremony of Congressman Kweisi Mfume, as President and CEO of the NAACP, an event that was attended by a very small but elite group of people, among them being the President and Vice President of the United States. I reflected back to the point in time when I would ride in the car with my grandfather on election day—a day that I equated to Thomas 'n Joyland carnival coming to town.